

REMARKS

This amendment accompanies a request for continued examination (RCE). Claims 1 and 2 are presented. Each is independent. Claim 1 has been amended to avoid the rejection in the outstanding Office action, and claim 2 is resubmitted without amendment, since it clearly avoids the rejection in the outstanding Office action.

The outstanding Office action rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 USC Section 102(b) as being anticipated by Arcuri et al. (6,121,968). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 as currently amended is directed to a communication terminal comprising a display unit which displays an original selection screen for selecting at least one of a plurality of options. Display control means causes display of the plurality of options on the display unit by division. A plurality of hardware keys is provided each of which is operated to select a corresponding one of the plurality of options not displayed on the display unit. The display control means causes, when an option not currently displayed has been selected, display of a screen associated with the selected option on the display unit. The display control means further causes when next displaying the original selection screen by operating one of the plurality of hardware keys, display of a screen that includes an indication of the selected option.

Claim 2 is directed to a communication terminal comprising a display unit that displays an original selection screen for selecting at least one of a plurality of options, display control means that causes display of options in the display unit by division, and a key for selecting an option not currently displayed on the display unit from a plurality of options. The display control means also

causes, when an option not currently displayed has been selected, display of a screen associated with the selected option on the display unit. Finally, it causes display of the selected option in reverse when displaying the original selection screen next by operating the key.

The invention as defined in Claim 1 is clearly patentable over Arcuri (U.S. Pat. No. 6,121,968).

As noted above, the communication terminal according to Claim 1 includes display control means which causes display of the plurality of options on the display unit by division, and a plurality of hardware keys each of which is operated to select a corresponding one of the plurality of options not currently displayed on the display unit. In contrast, the “key” in Arcuri et al. is not a key at all. Instead, the patent discloses moving a cursor icon on a screen to a location corresponding to a desired option and then clicking the mouse. There are no hardware keys in Arcuri that are dedicated to specified functions in the manner required by Claim 1. Thus, the apparatus of Arcuri et al. is structurally and functioning completely different from the invention as defined in Claim 1.

The invention as defined by Claim 2 is likewise patentable over the cited reference.

The Arcuri et al. patent discloses to a drop-down menu provided by a computer program in two states: a short menu and a long menu. A passage at col. 8, lines 50-56, describes it as follows:

Referring now to Fig. 2C, the user having found the desired “ruler” command 115 in the long menu 110 illustrated in Fig. 2B, selects the “ruler” command for use, and the command executes accordingly ... [U]pon execution of the “ruler” command 115, the menu pulled down by the user will disappear back into a “hidden” state.


The Examiner appears to equate the state shown in Fig. 2C of Arcuri et al. to that shown Fig. 35C of the present application. However, it is to be noted that, for example, "OPTION 6" in Fig. 35C of the present invention is highlighted in reverse. Displaying a selection in accordance with the invention is very helpful because the user can easily check whether he has correctly made his selection.

In contrast, in Fig. 2C of Arcuri et al., the "ruler" selected by the user is not shown reversed. While the patent does disclose a contrasting color scheme, that scheme does not respond to the language of claim 2. Instead, menu commands found on the long menu 110 which are not included in the short menu 100 are contrasted to allow the user to quickly and efficiently detect menu commands which are present in the long menu 110, but which are not present in the short menu 100 (col. 8, lines 39-47). Of course, that feature offers a user no help with the problem solved by the present invention.

Thus, the present invention as defined in Claim 2 is structurally and functionally different from the apparatus of Arcuri et al.

For the reasons indicated, the rejection is clearly inapplicable to the claims as now presented. Issuance of a notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
COOPER & DUNHAM LLP


Donald S. Dowden
Reg. No. 20,701